

moves from a position where the carrier unit is encased in the information processing device to a position where the carrier unit is exposed outside the information processing device.

Claims 25 and 26 depend from claim 24, so they also describe this subject matter.

The rejection relies on Dickenson et al. to teach the claimed subject matter quoted above. Specifically, the Office Action indicates that sensor 5 teaches an identification-information-acquisition device and that sensor module 2 teaches a carrier unit.

The claims also specify (either explicitly or by dependency) that applicants' identification-information-acquisition device has an "identification-information-acquisition unit," and the claims further specify that this element:

is configured to be detachable from the carrier unit in a state of being capable of receiving the identification information.

The rejection does not rely on Dickenson et al. to teach this subject matter. Instead, the rejection relies on Thomopoulos et al. to suggest modifying sensor 5 of Dickenson et al. to have an identification-information-acquisition unit with the claim feature quoted immediately above.

Applicants respectfully submit that, for multiple reasons, the Office Action does not provide an adequate justification for holding that Thomopoulos et al. suggests the modification upon which the rejection relies.

First, to show that a secondary prior art reference (Thomopoulos et al.) would have suggested modifying an element (the identification-information-acquisition unit) of a primary prior art reference (Dickenson et al.) to have a particular claim feature (operability when detached from the carrier unit), an Office Action must identify the unmodified element. However, the Office Action provides no indication of which part of sensor 5 of Dickenson et al. is an "identification-information-acquisition unit." Applicants of course acknowledge the

general citation of column 4, lines 52-61, but this is not an indication of which part of sensor 5 is the element to be modified. For at least this reason alone, the obviousness rejection has not been properly justified.

Also, the Office Action does not explain how sensor 5 could even function properly if it were somehow divided as implied. Note specifically that the claims specify that the identification-information-acquisition unit is detachable from the carrier unit but still capable of receiving the identification information.

Perhaps it was not the intention of the PTO to rely on Thomopoulos et al. to suggest detaching *a portion of* sensor 2 from sensor module 2. However, by relying on sensor 5 to disclose generally the identification-information-acquisition device and on sensor module 2 to teach a carrier unit specifically, the rejection implicitly relies on such a suggestion from Thomopoulos et al.

Regarding the suggestion to modify prior art, the Office Action cites column 6, lines 38-42, of Thomopoulos et al. The text from lines 38-43 includes the following:

The invention includes a video relay that allows one to daisy-chain in a network multiple interface boards that are used in the reading process of fingerprints, PINs, and electronic information on any type of a card, and an invented new design of a bi-directional RS232-to-RS485 converter for long-distance connections.

Applicants acknowledge the disclosure in Fig. 6 of two daisy-chain networks 148, 150.

However, the cited Thomopoulos et al. teachings merely show that fingerprint scanners can receive identification information when detached from a computer, if the scanners and the computer are joined using cables. Applicants submit that, *if* the Dickenson et al. laptop 11 were to be modified accordingly, one skilled in the art would be more likely to remove the *entire* interface card 1 (that is, housing 6 and all the contents therein) from slot 9 of the laptop and then

connect interface card 1 and laptop 11 using cables. Under this configuration, sensor 5 would *not* be detached from sensor module 2.

Although the Office Action cites the Thomopoulos et al. disclosure of scanner 104 as “detachable” from computer 106 and connectable via cables 108, the Office Action does not explain how Thomopoulos et al. supposedly suggests dividing sensor 5 so that a portion is detached from sensor module 2. In fact, it is not clear that the sensor would function properly under such a modification.


In view of the explanations provided above in response to statements provided in the Office Action as justification for a modification being held obvious, applicants submit that Thomopoulos et al. does not really support the obviousness rejection. Accordingly, withdrawal of the obviousness rejection is now solicited.

In a separate matter, applicants note that the Office Action does not acknowledge receipt of the Information Disclosure Statements (IDSs) filed January 19, 2005 and July 18, 2005. Applicants request that the next communication from the PTO provide such acknowledgement.

In view of the remarks and amendments above, applicants submit that the entire application is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, a Notice of Allowability is hereby requested. If for any reason it is believed that this application is not now in condition for allowance, the Examiner is welcome to contact applicants’ undersigned attorney at the telephone number indicated below to discuss resolution of the remaining issues.

If this paper is not timely filed, applicants petition for an extension of time. The fee for the extension, and any other fees that may be due, may be debited from Deposit Account No. 50-2866.

Respectfully submitted,
WESTERMAN, HATTORI, DANIELS & ADRIAN, LLP



Joseph L. Felber
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 48,109
Telephone: (202) 822-1100
Facsimile: (202) 822-1111

Enclosure: Petition for extension of time

JLF/af

Q:\2000\000993A\000993A response to 8-19-05 action.doc